

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

<b>DAVID WAYNE VICKERS,</b>	)	<b>CASE NO. 1:24 CV 1642</b>
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	<b>JUDGE DAVID A. RUIZ</b>
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	
	)	
<b>U.S. ATTORNEY</b>	)	<b>ORDER</b>
<b>BRIDGET M. BRENNAN, et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

On February 19, 2025, this Court dismissed *pro se* Plaintiff David Wayne Vickers’s civil complaint against former United States Attorney Bridget M. Brennan, and Assistant United States Attorney Brian McDonough. (R. 6 & 7). Plaintiff filed an objection to the Court’s Order, asserting it did not consider the causes of action set forth in his Amended Complaint. (R. 8).<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff is mistaken. The Court’s Memorandum and Opinion Order specifically mentioned the Amended Complaint (R. 4), but found that the Amended Complaint, like the initial Complaint, “fails to state a viable cause of action for the foregoing reasons.” (R. 6, PageID# 79).

Plaintiff’s Objection (R. 8) fails to persuade the Court any error of law occurred and it is, therefore, DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

March 14, 2025

/s/ David A. Ruiz  
DAVID A. RUIZ  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> “Objections” are not available to a District Court’s order. The Court construes Plaintiff’s submission as a request for reconsideration pursuant to Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure since it was filed within twenty-eight days of the judgment. *See, e.g., Robinson v. Vigorito, Barker, Patterson, Nichols & Porter, LLP.*, 2019 WL 13417192, at \*1 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 20, 2019); *Lagmay v. Nakakuni*, 2018 WL 10593814, at \*1 (D. Haw. Feb. 16, 2018).